

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

ERIKA CONNER, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 2:10-CV-0511

JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE MARK R. ABEL

CITY OF COLUMBUS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff Erika Conner's Motion in Limine (Doc. 16). Plaintiff seeks to exclude two videos on the basis that neither of the videos have any relevance to this suit: (1) a video of an interview that she gave to a Columbus police detective on June 9, 2008; and (2) a video that she labels as "City Hall tape." It is unclear as to whether the "City Hall tape" that Plaintiff refers to is either the security video of the incident at issue or news footage that captures live shots of various parts of the incident.

However, as Defendants assert in their Memorandum in Opposition (Doc. 18), all three videos are relevant under Fed. R. Evid. 401. With regard to the first video, Defendants contend that during her interview with the Columbus police detective, Plaintiff made a number of statements about the incident at issue that directly contradict the allegations in her complaint and support the testimony of the Defendants. The statements Plaintiff made are relevant, as that term is defined by Fed. R. Evid. 401.

With regard to the second video, although it is unclear as to whether the "City Hall tape" Plaintiff refers to is either the security video of the incident or news footage that captures live

shots of various parts of the incident, both are relevant as that term is defined by Fed. R. Evid. 401.

Moreover, Plaintiff authenticated all three of the videos during her deposition, which was taken before she filed her Motion in Limine. For good cause shown, therefore, Plaintiff's Motion in Limine (Doc. 16) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

12-7-2011
DATED


EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE